

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 4:00 p.m. Tuesday, March 11, 2008
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

A. Robert Linscheid, Chair
George G. Gowgani, Vice Chair
Herbert L. Carter
Carol R. Chandler
Kenneth Fong
William Hauck
Peter G. Mehas
Jennifer Reimer
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of January 22, 2008

1. Amend the 2007-2008 Capital Outlay Program, Non-State Funded, *Action*

Discussion Items

2. Status Report on the 2008-2009 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, *Information*
3. Approval of Schematic Plans, *Action*

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS**

**Trustees of the California State University
Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California**

January 22, 2008

Members Present

A. Robert Linscheid, Chair
George G. Gowgani, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg, Chair of the Board
Herbert L. Carter
Kenneth Fong
William Hauck
Peter G. Mehas
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Jennifer Reimer
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the November 2007 meeting were approved as submitted.

Amend the 2007-2008 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Linscheid presented agenda item 1 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 1-08-01).

Status Report on the 2008-2009 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor's Budget

Assistant Vice Chancellor Elvyra F. San Juan presented the status report with the use of a PowerPoint presentation and a handout, stating that the governor's budget approved a \$357.9 million 2008-2009 State Funded Capital Outlay Program. The Department of Finance did not approve of moving forward with all the phases of certain projects due to the scheduling of the bond election in November, which would delay the availability of the project funds.

Trustee Linscheid asked what caused a negative FTE as noted on the priority list. Ms. San Juan explained that in the case of the San Diego Storm/Nasatir Halls Renovation, an amount of lecture space is being converted to needed faculty offices, thus the deficit. However, a prior project had built the new replacement space for lecture, allowing this renovation project to proceed.

Trustee Linscheid also inquired whether there was any explanation for the exclusion of the requested \$15 million for off-site mitigation from the 2008-2009 governor's budget. Ms. San Juan responded that staff believe the governor's budget is pushing the decision regarding off-site mitigation funding to the legislature.

Trustee Tsakopoulos asked how the \$15 million would be used for off-site campus impacts. Ms. San Juan stated that the majority of the funds, approximately 95%, would be for traffic-related impacts.

Trustee Linscheid remarked that the 2008-2012 five-year capital outlay budget identified a \$5 billion need and the current budget reflects \$357 million, therefore there is a great need for the state to continue to pass general obligation bonds in that regard.

Trustee Linscheid adjourned the meeting.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 2007-2008 Capital Outlay Program, Non-State Funded

Presentation by

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This item requests approval to amend the 2007-08 non-state capital outlay program to include the following two projects:

- | | | |
|---|------------|---------------------|
| 1. California State University, Fresno | | |
| University High School | PWC | \$15,486,000 |

California State University, Fresno wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the University High School. The project will construct a new 37,500 GSF facility to house 400 students. The new facilities will be located southeast of Joyal Administration Building, west of Smittcamp Alumni House and north of Parking Lot C. The building consists of three components: a one-story administrative wing on the northwest side of the building; a two-story classroom wing that runs east and west along the north side of the building; and a one-story music wing which is at the southeast corner. The classroom wing will house general classrooms, science labs, a computer music room, and a health/physical education room. Three rehearsal rooms for band, orchestra and chorus along with practice rooms, instrument storage, and a music library will be located in the music wing. The administrative center, located near the main entry, will accommodate school reception space, principal and administrator offices, a counseling center and faculty support facilities.

The project will be funded from state public school resources (not CSU funds) with design and construction funding coming primarily from the California Charter School Facilities Program.

- | | | |
|---|------------|--------------------|
| 2. California State University, Sacramento | | |
| Electronic Message Board | PWC | \$1,280,000 |

California State University, Sacramento wishes to proceed with the design and construction of an electronic message board. The sign panel, measuring 48 feet by 14 feet, and a total height of 85 feet, would be located on the southern end of campus, visible to drivers on Highway 50. The

message board would be leased out for advertising and also would be used by the university to post event notifications. The university will receive a share of the advertisement revenue generated by the message board. Additionally, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) will use the sign for the purpose of displaying "Amber Alert" messages in keeping with Amber Alert guidelines and criteria and, on a space available basis, for the purpose of providing public service messages containing reports of commute times, drunken driving awareness, reports of accidents of a serious nature, and emergency disaster information.

The project will be funded by the developer, Clear Channel Outdoor.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2007/2008 non-state funded capital outlay program is amended to include:
1) \$15,486,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Fresno, University High School project and;
2) \$1,280,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the California State University, Sacramento, Electronic Message Board project.

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Status Report on the 2008-2009 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Presentation By

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This item presents a comparison between the trustees' capital outlay request, the governor's budget proposal, and the legislative analyst's office (LAO) recommendations, shown in Attachment A.

Background

The California State University's proposed 2008-09 Capital Outlay Program and the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2008-09 through 2012-13 were presented at the September 2007 Board of Trustees' meeting. The trustees approved a 2008-09 state funded priority list totaling \$452.6 million. The governor's budget was published on January 10, 2008, and included \$357.9 million for 24 CSU projects funded from old bond funds (\$42.9 million) and a proposed future 2008 general obligation bond fund (\$315.0 million). The governor's budget recommended an increase in CSU's annual capital funding from \$345 million to \$395 million for a total of \$790 million from the proposed two-year general obligation bond fund.

Update

On February 20, 2008, the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) released its *Analysis of the 2008-09 Budget Bill*. The analyst supports \$354.9 million of the \$357.9 million included in the governor's budget. The analyst recommended that:

- (1) Existing bond funds, instead of the 2008 bond funds, be used to complete 6 equipment projects in the 2008-09 governor's budget.
- (2) The 2008 bond measure be of sufficient size to complete all projects approved by the legislature—plus any amount that the legislature wishes to reserve for new projects in subsequent years. If the legislature approves all of the projects in the governor's 2008-09 budget proposal, the 2008 bond's allocation to CSU should be at least \$692 million.

- (3) The legislature reduce \$490,000 from the preparation of preliminary plans and working drawings for the CSU Sacramento, Science II, Phase 2 project, and reduce future costs by \$6.1 million, to reduce laboratory space and delete the proposed museum and planetarium. The increase in laboratory capacity is not considered to be justified due to underutilization of facilities during the summer term and the museum and planetarium are not justified in comparison to state priorities.
- (4) The legislature not approve the proposed CSU Chico, Taylor II Replacement Building and delete \$2.6 million for preparation of preliminary plans and working drawings for this facility because the increase in instructional capacity is not justified due to the underutilization of facilities during the summer term.

Also, in the *Analysis* is discussion on a higher education issue *Intersegmental: Addressing the Local Impacts of Campus Growth*. This section provides an overview of the segments' environmental review process, discusses the *Marina* case, and offers recommendations to the legislature on how to address the local environmental impacts of campus expansion. The discussion raises concern on the CSU's policy to allow a project to proceed should the legislature not approve requested mitigation funding as inconsistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The analyst identified options to fund requests for mitigation funding as:

- Provide state funding for the fair-share amount
- Share funding with segment's non-state sources
- Reject the request

Along with any funding action, the analyst recommends the legislature state its intent by adopting budget language for each request for off-site mitigation funds, or that CEQA statutes could be amended to clarify that the lack of a specific state appropriation shall not allow a lead agency to declare an impact as "significant and unavoidable" and move forward with the project (CSU's current approach).

The analyst liked that CSU attempts to negotiate early with local agencies on significant impacts so that the board was aware of off-site costs to implement a master plan revision at the time of approving a master plan and that the legislature could also consider such costs when approving a proposed project. As to the best approach to when payments are made to the local agency, the analyst concluded that this is best determined on a case-by-case basis. The differences in campus situations and the differing local agencies drove this conclusion.

The analyst's near term recommendations to the legislature include:

- Support language that allows payments for off-campus mitigation in future bond proposals

- Address the CSU's off-campus mitigation policy
- Direct the California Community Colleges and the State Allocation Board to allow the use of state funds for off-site mitigation costs versus rely on paying costs from local funds.

State Funded Capital Outlay Program 2008/09 Priority List
Cost Estimates are at Engineering News-Record California Building Construction Cost Index 5179 and Equipment Price Index 279⁶

Rank Order	Category	Campus	Project Title	Trustees' Request		Governor's Budget		Legislative Analyst's Office		
				FTE	Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars	Phase	Dollars
1	IA	Statewide	Minor Capital Outlay		PWC	25,000,000	PWC	25,000,000	PWC	25,000,000
2	IA	Statewide	Capital Renewal		PWC	50,000,000 (a)	PWC	50,000,000 (c)	PWC	50,000,000
3	IA	Statewide	Mitigation of Off-Campus Impacts		PWC	15,000,000	PWC	0 (d)	PWC	0
4	II	Los Angeles	Forensic Science Building	N/A	E	575,000	E	575,000	E	575,000 (b)
5	IB	Chico	Student Services Center	N/A	E	2,432,000	E	2,432,000	E	2,432,000 (b)
6	II	Northridge	Science I Replacement	N/A	E	4,499,000	E	4,499,000	E	4,499,000 (b)
7	IA	East Bay	Student Services Replacement Building	N/A	E	1,963,000	E	1,963,000	E	1,963,000 (b)
8	II	Dominguez Hills	Educational Resource Center Addition	N/A	E	3,664,000	E	3,664,000	E	3,664,000 (b)
9	II	Northridge	Performing Arts Center ◊	N/A	E	6,032,000	E	6,032,000	E	6,032,000 (b)
10	IA	Channel Islands	Entrance Road	N/A	C	23,822,000 (b)	C	23,822,000 (b)	C	23,822,000
11	IA	San Bernardino	Access Compliance Barrier Removal	N/A	PWC	10,510,000 (b)	PWC	10,510,000 (b)	PWC	10,510,000 (b)
12	IA	East Bay	Warren Hall (Seismic) ◊	-526	PW	3,468,000 (b)	PW	3,468,000 (b)	PW	3,468,000
13	IA	East Bay	Warren Hall Telecommunications Relocation	N/A	PWC	2,003,000 (b)	PWC	2,003,000 (e)	PWC	2,003,000
14	IA	Humboldt	Library Seismic Safety Upgrade	N/A	PW	454,000	PW	454,000	PW	454,000
15	II	Channel Islands	Classroom/Faculty Office Reno./Add.	1,050	C	30,128,000	C	30,128,000	C	30,128,000
16	IB	San Diego	Storm/Nasatir Halls Renovation ◊	-2,196	C	47,169,000	C	47,169,000	C	47,169,000
17	IB	Bakersfield	Art Center and Satellite Plant	177	WC	17,292,000	WC	17,292,000	WC	17,292,000
18	IB	Stanislaus	Science I Renovation (Seismic)	422	C	16,731,000	C	16,731,000	C	16,731,000
19	IB	San Luis Obispo	Center for Science ◊	66	C	99,620,000	C	99,620,000	C	99,620,000
20	II	Monterey Bay	Academic Building II	1,243	PWC	38,092,000	PW	2,145,000 (f)	PW	2,145,000
21	IB	San Jose	Spartan Complex Renovation (Seismic)	62	PW	2,769,000	P	1,162,000 (g)	P	1,162,000
22	IB	Maritime	Physical Education Replacement	0	PW	1,928,000	P	917,000 (g)	P	917,000
23	II	Channel Islands	West Hall	438	P	868,000	P	868,000	P	868,000
24	II	Chico	Taylor II Replacement Building	751	PWc	4,982,000	PW	2,637,000 (h)	PW	0 (j)
25	IB	Sacramento	Science II, Phase 2	924	PWc	10,965,000 (b)	PW	4,826,000 (i)	PW	4,336,000 (k)
Totals				2,411		\$419,966,000		\$357,917,000		\$354,790,000

Notes: Trustees' Request

- (a) \$2,000,000 funded by old bond funds.
- (b) Proposed from old bond funds.

Governor's Budget

- (c) Funded by University Capital Outlay Bond Fund (UCOBF) of 2008.
- (d) Not included in Governor's Budget.
- (e) \$241,000 (PW) funded by HECOBF 2004, the remainder funded from UCOBF 2008.
- (f) Funded as a non-streamlined project; C phase deferred (\$35,947,000).
- (g) W phase deferred (San Jose: \$1,607,000; Maritime: \$1,011,000).
- (h) c phase deferred (\$2,345,000).
- (i) Funded by HECOBF 1988; c phase deferred (\$6,139,000).

LAO Recommendation

- (j) Recommend deletion (\$2,637,000).
- (k) Recommend partial program reduction (\$490,000).

Categories:

- I. Existing Facilities/Infrastructure
 - A. Critical Infrastructure Deficiencies
 - B. Modernization/Renovation
- II. New Facilities/Infrastructure

◊ This project is dependent upon state and non-state funding.

A = Acquisition P = Preliminary plans W = Working drawings C = Construction E = Equipmen

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS, AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design, and Construction

Summary

Schematic plans for the following four projects will be presented for approval:

- 1. California State University, Fresno—University High School**
Project Architect: DKSJ Architects

Background and Scope

California State University, Fresno proposes to construct a 37,500 GSF facility for University High School, a Fresno Unified School District charter high school, on CSU property leased to the district. The new facility (#134) will be located southeast of Joyal Administration Building and west of Smittcamp Alumni House. The completion of this project will allow the high school to move out of the temporary trailers that currently house the student population of 400 students.

The building consists of three components: a one story administrative wing of 6,250 GSF; a two-story classroom wing of 21,000 GSF that will include classrooms, science labs, computer music rooms and health physical education rooms; and a one-story music wing of 10,250 GSF which will house three rehearsal rooms. The administration wing is linked to the music wing via a roof structure supported by concrete pilasters which helps define a landscaped quad, an outdoor space for student social interaction, recreation and outdoor assembly. The University High School project will be constructed with a concrete slab-on-grade foundation and a steel structural system, with a stucco exterior finish.

There are many sustainable design features incorporated into the project, which will be designed to be LEED certified. The building is oriented to maximize daylighting opportunities with north and south facing windows, and ceilings designed with a slope to capture indirect sunlight. West facing walls have almost no fenestration and are highly insulated to shield the building from the harsh valley afternoon sun. Windows will be dual-glazed with low emission coatings for enhanced energy efficiency. The interior lighting will utilize high efficiency fluorescent lamps that will include daylighting and occupancy controls. The mechanical system is designed to

exceed Title 24 energy requirements by more than 25 percent and will be controlled by an energy management system.

Many of the building materials will be specified with high recycled content using local/regional materials that have low-emitting indoor environmental qualities and construction waste will be managed to divert a high percentage of waste from the landfills to be recycled. The landscaping will incorporate water efficient plant materials and will utilize an irrigation system that achieves a 20% reduction in water use.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	April 2008
Working Drawings Completed	May 2008
Construction Start	July 2008
Occupancy	August 2009

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	37,500 square feet
Assignable Building Area	26,400 square feet
Efficiency	70 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 4890

Building Cost (\$313 per GSF)	\$11,752,000
-------------------------------	--------------

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$18.35
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$85.49
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$67.92
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$98.96
e. Equipment	\$ 5.55
f. General Conditions	\$37.12

Site Development (includes landscaping)	<u>1,143,000</u>
---	------------------

Construction Cost	\$12,895,000
Fees	1,780,000
Additional Services	166,000
Contingency	<u>645,000</u>

Total Project Cost (\$413 per GSF)	<u>\$15,486,000</u>
------------------------------------	---------------------

Cost Comparison

The project's building cost of \$313 per GSF is less than the \$343 per GSF for the comparable International Polytechnic High School at Cal Poly Pomona approved in March 2007, as well as the \$319 per GSF for the LA County High School for the Arts at CSU Los Angeles approved in May 2007, both adjusted to CCCI 4890.

Funding Data

The project is funded by the Fresno Unified School District, through the California Charter School Facilities Program.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A Notice of Exemption has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. The Notice of Exemption will be filed with the State Clearinghouse as required.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that:

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Fresno, University High School, has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. The proposed project will not have significant adverse impacts on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
3. The schematic plans for the California State University, Fresno, University High School are approved at a project cost of \$15,486,000 at CCCI 4890.

2. Humboldt State University—Housing Replacement and Addition, Phase 1

Project Architect: RSK Associates

Background and Scope

Humboldt State University proposes to construct a new apartment style student housing project (#50A) located in the southwest corner of the campus, bounded by LK Wood Boulevard on the west, Harpst Street on the north, Rossow Street on the east, and 14th Street on the south. The project will provide 434 new beds, replacing 156 beds of student housing in functionally

obsolete buildings (Redwood Manor and Mai Kai) programmed for demolition, for a net capacity of 278 beds. The proposed seven-acre site is currently used as the campus soccer field. It will be reoriented and replaced with an all weather turf playfield as part of the project.

The project will construct four three-story housing buildings, a community center/convenience store, and a maintenance/support facility for a total of 136,585 GSF. The residence buildings will house 76 four-bedroom apartments with four beds, 21 four-bedroom apartments with six beds, and two two-bedroom apartments with two beds for a total of 99 apartments and 434 beds. Each four-bedroom apartment has two bathrooms, a full kitchen, and a living and dining area. The front door of each apartment faces a central courtyard, with bedrooms to the outside of the complex.

The community center building is comprised of a multi-purpose room, mail room, office conference/study rooms, the market place (a convenience store/dining operation), and support spaces. The courtyard and outdoor common spaces have been designed to accommodate multiple outdoor activities. The buildings will be wood-framed construction on concrete slab foundations. Exterior building finishes will be cement-plaster with accent areas of wood, cement board siding, and metal and wood sunshades.

The project will be designed to be LEED equivalent and exceed Title 24 requirements by 15 percent. There are multiple sustainable features included in the design. The project has a greater density than the current campus housing complex, reducing the building footprint. The buildings' orientation and massing limits the impact of prevailing wind and creates a sheltered central courtyard/common area.

Energy conservation is addressed through shading via overhangs on the commons building, daylighting in bedrooms and common areas, and the use of high efficiency light fixtures and energy saving controls. The project's mechanical systems are energy efficient and optimized by the use of energy management control systems located in each room. Additional energy efficiency measures include maximum insulation values for walls and roofs and enhanced window performance from double-glazed windows with low emission coatings. The project will not be air conditioned, and includes operable windows.

The project targets recycled content in heavily used project materials like concrete, drywall, and carpet. The demolition of existing asphalt paving will provide recycled materials for the foundation base. Storm water run-off is mitigated through natural filtration and diffusion to landscaped areas.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed

April 2008

Working Drawings Completed June 2008
Construction Start September 2008
Occupancy July 2010

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area 136,585 square feet
Assignable Building Area 102,596 square feet
Efficiency 75 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 4890

Building Cost (\$177 per GSF) \$24,237,000

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 5.68
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$44.70
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$46.62
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$69.82
e. Equipment	\$10.41
f. Demolition	\$ 0.23

Site Development (includes landscaping and playfield) 7,035,000

Construction Cost \$31,272,000

Fees 4,157,000

Additional Services 944,000

Contingency 4,038,000

Total Project Cost (\$296 per GSF) \$40,411,000

Group II Equipment 4,355,000

Grand Total \$44,766,000

Cost Comparison

The project's building cost of \$177 per GSF is lower than the \$211 per GSF for the new construction portion of the Channel Islands Student Housing II project approved in January 2006 and lower than the \$192 per GSF for the Sonoma Tuscany Village Student Housing project approved in May 2007, both adjusted to CCCI 4890.

Funding Data

The Housing Replacement and Addition, Phase 1 project was reviewed by the CSU Housing Proposal Review Committee in January 2007. Funding for the project will be via the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program (\$41,766,000) and from HSU housing program reserves (\$3,000,000). The bonds will be repaid from housing revenue.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

This project was included in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Humboldt State University master plan revision which was certified by the trustees in November 2004. The university completed an addendum to the master plan FEIR in December 2006. The addendum determined that implementation of the Housing Replacement and Addition, Phase 1 project as proposed would not result in any new or substantially different impacts than those identified in the 2004 master plan FEIR. An additional environmental analysis is not required because the project as proposed is not substantially different from that described in the 2004 FEIR, and only minor revisions of the project description are necessary to be consistent with the 2004 FEIR. This project is consistent with all required mitigation measures in the 2004 FEIR. Although CEQA does not require circulation of an addendum to a certified EIR, the university has provided the document to the City of Arcata in order to inform the community of campus development. No additional comment or other input was received from the city after their review of the revised project description in the addendum. A copy of the FEIR and the addendum will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that:

1. The board finds that the November 2004 Humboldt State University, Master Plan Final EIR and the Addendum completed in December 2006 for the Humboldt State University, Housing Replacement and Addition, Phase 1 project, has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. The project before this board is consistent with the project description as analyzed in the Addendum to the previously certified Final EIR and does not propose substantial changes to the original project description, which would require major revision to the Final EIR or Findings adopted by this board in certifying said Final EIR.

3. With the implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the master plan previously approved by the Board of Trustees, the proposed project will not have significant adverse impacts on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
4. The mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6).
3. The schematic plans for the Humboldt State University, Housing Replacement and Addition, Phase 1, are approved at a project cost of \$44,766,000 at CCCCI 4890.

3. California State University, Long Beach—Student Recreation and Wellness Center
Project Architect: Cannon Design
CM at Risk Contractor: C.W. Driver

Background and Scope

California State University, Long Beach proposes to construct a Student Recreation and Wellness Center (#93) in conjunction with the Associated Students Inc., who will be the operators of the facility. The project will provide a 109,000 GSF two-story recreation facility for students, faculty, staff, and the public. The proposed site, south of Parking Structure 2 (#91) on the east side of the campus, is currently a parking lot with approximately 500 spaces that will be displaced by the construction of the project. The replacement of parking has been included in Parking Structure 3, currently under construction north of this site, along with 76 spaces being included in this project.

The new complex will include a three-court gymnasium, two multi-activity center gymnasiums, an elevated jogging track, cardiovascular machines and free weights, multipurpose activity spaces, racquetball courts, a rock climbing wall, locker rooms, showers, social lounges, a juice bar, vending machine area, and administrative offices. Located centrally in the facility is the wellness center which provides space for a performance and fitness lab, counseling, and consultation. There will be an exterior pool with three lap lanes, space for water volleyball and recreation, a spa, deck space for gatherings, and a sand volleyball court.

The building's structure will be a steel brace frame and the exterior skin will be a combination of brick, glass window walls, and pre-finished metal panels. The building will be designed to be LEED Silver. Sustainable features will include natural lighting using clearstory windows for increased daylight into the interior of the building. Building systems are design to be both energy

and water efficient. Durability, ease of maintenance, wear resistance, and sustainability are all important design factors given the high usage expected in the facility.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	May 2008
Working Drawings Completed	October 2008
Construction Start	March 2009
Occupancy	August 2010

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	109,000 square feet
Assignable Building Area	80,000 square feet
Efficiency	73 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 4890

Building Cost (\$405 per GSF)	\$44,113,000
-------------------------------	--------------

<i>Systems Breakdown (includes Group I)</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 22.89
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$136.94
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 81.77
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$147.85
e. Equipment	\$ 15.25

Pool	821,000
Site Development (includes landscaping and parking)	<u>4,778,000</u>

Construction Cost	\$49,712,000
Fees	8,451,000
Additional Services	829,000
Contingency	<u>4,751,000</u>

Total Project Cost (\$585 per GSF)	\$63,743,000
Group II Equipment	<u>2,500,000</u>

Grand Total	<u>\$66,243,000</u>
-------------	---------------------

Cost Comparison

Recent comparable facility types are the Sacramento Recreation Wellness Center at a project cost of \$307 per GSF approved in May 2007, the Chico Wildcat Activity Center at a project cost of \$303 per GSF approved in July 2006, and the Fullerton Student Recreation Center at a project cost of \$363 per GSF approved in July 2005, all adjusted to CCCI 4890. The building cost of \$405 per GSF for this project is higher than the other recreation centers in part due to increased costs for the foundation to address poor soils condition; for the shell as a result of building skin materials; and for the long span moment steel frame structure required to enclose five basketball courts. In addition, the Fullerton and proposed Long Beach projects have elevated in-door running tracks, while the Sacramento and Chico projects do not.

Funding Data

A student referendum in February 2007 approved the Student Recreation and Wellness Center and an associated student fee increase of \$109 per semester. The project will be financed via the issuance of bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program, which will be repaid from the Associated Student fees.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

The development of this non-state facility was analyzed as part of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) prepared for the campus master plan revision that was certified and approved by the Board of Trustees in July 2003.

The Student Recreation and Wellness Center building has been found to be consistent with the project description and the respective analysis in the FEIR previously approved by this board and identified above, and therefore a Finding of Consistency has been made and requires no additional review or analysis for CEQA compliance. The Finding of Consistency will be available with the FEIR at the meeting.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that:

1. The project is consistent with the CSU Long Beach campus master plan revision approved by the Board of Trustees in July 2003 and a Finding of Consistency has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The project before this board is consistent with the project description as analyzed in the previously certified Final EIR and does not propose substantial changes to the original project description, which would require major revision to the Final EIR or Findings adopted by this board in certifying said Final EIR.
3. With the implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the master plan previously approved by the Board of Trustees, the proposed project will have no new or previously undisclosed significant effects on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
4. The mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the requirements of the California environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code section 21081.6).
5. The schematic plans for the California State University, Long Beach, Student Recreation and Wellness Center are approved at a project cost of \$66,243,000 at CCCI 4890.

4. San Diego State University—Storm/Nasatir Halls Renovation
Project Architect: LPA

Background and Scope

San Diego State University proposes to renovate the existing Storm/Nasatir building complex (#8 and 18), a two building, three-story reinforced concrete structure built in 1957 with an addition constructed in 1989. The project will also construct new space (32,000 GSF) to house two lecture halls (300- and 500-seats, respectively), faculty offices, and a convenience store. The 500-seat lecture space is an increase in scope to be paid with continuing Education Reserve Funds. The renovation will make corrections to health and safety deficiencies as well as provide upgraded program space for the departments of political science, sociology, economics, anthropology, geography, European studies, linguistics and rhetoric, and writing.

The corrections to the buildings will include abatement of asbestos and lead paint, a new energy efficient, code-compliant HVAC system, new lighting and ceiling systems, telephone and data system upgrades, fire alarm upgrade, security system upgrades, and electrical system corrections. New windows and exterior finishes to improve the energy efficiency and appearance of the building, as well as new code compliant signage are also included in the project scope. The building complex will be renovated with new elevators, ramps, sitework, door operators, and other improvements to make the building fully accessible. The campus will renovate the existing

buildings in two phases in order to allow a portion of the building to remain in operation during the renovation project.

Sustainable features are designed to exceed Title 24 requirements by at least 15 percent. The features include HVAC with a direct digital control system to monitor and control all mechanical, ventilation and plumbing systems; lighting energy efficiency measures such as photocell controls and timers, motion sensors for two level lighting, and energy efficient lamps and ballast; and additional roof insulation and dual-pane windows that act to reduce heat gain/loss. Existing paving and construction materials to be removed will be recycled to the maximum extent possible.

Timing (Estimated)

Preliminary Plans Completed	May 2008
Working Drawings Completed	November 2009
Construction Start (Phase 1)	January 2009
Construction Complete (Phase 1)	June 2010
Construction Start (Phase 2)	July 2010
Construction Complete (Phase 2)	December 2011

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	133,693 square feet
Assignable Building Area	87,350 square feet
Efficiency	65 percent

Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 4890

Building Cost (\$247 per GSF)	\$33,037,000
-------------------------------	--------------

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 3.50
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$ 49.91
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ 60.01
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)	\$109.33
e. Special Construction and Demolition	\$ 24.35

Site Development (includes landscaping)	<u>4,224,000</u>
---	------------------

Construction Cost	\$37,261,000
Fees	8,549,000

Additional Services	698,000
Contingency	<u>8,128,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$435 per GSF)	\$54,636,000
Group II Equipment	<u>3,561,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$58,197,000</u>

Cost Comparison

The project's building cost of \$247 per GSF is higher than the building cost of \$223 per GSF for Darwin Hall Renovation at Sonoma State University, approved in February 2004, adjusted to CCCI 4890. The increased cost is due to the fact that about twenty-five percent of the San Diego project is new construction with a higher associated cost than renovation only. Additionally, the higher costs are attributable to a lack of surge space and the consequent need to phase the project over several years.

Funding Data

The project is funded from state and non-state sources. It received \$2,552,000 in the 2007-2008 State Capital Outlay Budget appropriation for preliminary plans and working drawings. Future state funding in the amount of \$49,559,000 will be requested as follows: \$47,169,000 for construction in the 2008-2009 State Capital Outlay Budget; \$2,390,000 for equipment in a future budget year. The non-state component of the project (\$6,086,000) will be funded from Continuing Education Reserve Funds and through Aztec Shops, a recognized campus auxiliary organization.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

The Storm/Nasatir Halls Renovation project was approved as a Minor Master Plan Amendment to the master plan revision approved by the board in March 2001. A Notice of Exemption has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. The Notice of Exemption will be filed with the State Clearinghouse as required.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that:

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the San Diego State University, Storm/Nasatir Halls Renovation has been prepared and filed pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The proposed project will not have significant adverse impacts on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.
3. The schematic plans for the San Diego State University, Storm/Nasatir Halls Renovation are approved at a project cost of \$58,197,000 at CCCI 4890.